



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS LAW. The full text of the law as enacted, with copious annotations. By John J. Crawford. Second edition. New York: Baker, Voorhis & Co. 1902. pp. xxxiv, 173. 8vo.

The second edition of Mr. Crawford's book follows closely upon the first edition of 1897, and, although only six decisions upon the Uniform Act have been handed down since that date, the author finds his excuse for a new edition in the needs of the lawyers of the fourteen states which have in the mean time adopted the Code. He devotes himself in this second edition to the task of making the work of local value in those states. His purpose is to point out changes made in the existing law by the Act and to give citations from the different jurisdictions. He does not, however, seem to be uniformly successful. Several instances can be found where marked changes in the existing law are not clearly pointed out, as where, for example, on page 64, in the section on irregular indorsers, the Massachusetts decisions are not included in the list of those which hold that an anomalous indorser is liable as a joint maker. Again the citation of authorities is often noticeably incomplete. The omissions are doubtless due to a desire for brevity, but they decrease the book's value to the practising lawyer who seeks a guide to the leading decisions in his state.

In this second edition, with its wider aim, there seems little excuse for retaining the peculiar, meaningless section numbering adopted in New York. There is a substantial uniformity among the states in this matter, but, as appears from the author's footnotes, none have adopted the New York system. The Index shows no improvement and is inadequate to the needs of those who use the book as a reference manual.

A TREATISE ON THE LAW OF FRAUD AND MISTAKE. By William Williamson Kerr. Third edition by Sydney E. Williams. London: Sweet & Maxwell, Limited. 1902. pp. lxxv, 557. 8vo.

Since the appearance of the second edition of this book in 1883, the law relating to fraud and mistake has undergone substantial development, and this further revision of a standard work cannot fail to be received with interest. Like the preceding edition it deals exclusively with the English law, no American cases being cited. The present volume is of about the same dimensions as the earlier; a considerable amount of new matter has been added and much that was obsolete has been wisely omitted, leaving a text forty pages shorter than that of 1883. The topical arrangement of the earlier work is retained with slight alterations and to a great extent the original form of statement is preserved.

The most extensive changes are found in the chapter on Misrepresentation and Concealment, necessitated principally by the important decision in *Derry v. Peek*, 14 A. C. 337, holding that negligent misrepresentation as distinguished from fraudulent misrepresentation will not ground an action of deceit. Unfortunately here where most is hoped for, the work seems most deficient. While Mr. Williams may be quite right in attacking the doctrine of *Derry v. Peek*, the question is but little clarified by a treatment consisting largely of the comments of judges and presenting only a brief and unanalytical statement of the editor's own views. That the House of Lords may have been wrong in its interpretation of the facts Mr. Williams does not even intimate; and yet writers of no less authority than Sir Frederick Pollock and Sir William R. Anson agree in so thinking. 5 L. Quart. Rev. 410, 422; 6 L. Quart. Rev. 72, 73. Again, in attempting to reconcile *Derry v. Peek* with certain earlier cases which are generally regarded as having been overruled by it, the editor's argument is far from convincing.

A similar want of close analysis and correct appreciation is detected in other parts of the volume, as where the subject of the conditional revocation of wills is disposed of in a single paragraph; and where sanction is given to the questionable distinction taken by the English cases between an equity and an equi-